

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 09/852,014
Attorney Docket Q64333
September 20, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

In the last Office Action Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite on the grounds that the dependent claim states “at least one catalytic layer” while the independent claim states “a catalytic layer”.

Claim 11 has been amended to delete the reference to “any one of the preceding claims” and is now clearly an independent claim. Claim 11 has been further amended to now call for “at least one catalytic layer”.

In the last Office Action Claims 1-11 inclusive were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohsaki et al. (US Pat. 4,594,287).

The patent to Ohsaki et al. does not disclose or even suggest the provision of at least one plate heat exchanger embedded within a catalytic layer (i.e. a reaction space) supported in a reactor shell. The patent to Ohsaki et al. clearly teaches the use of plate exchangers merely for preheating the reaction gases in a preheating chamber 38 free of catalyst while in catalytic reaction space 12 tubular heat exchangers should be used as shown in Figure 13 and described in column 2, lines 20-38. According to the present invention it is possible to obtain an isothermal reactor which is very simple to manufacture and of easy maintenance since the plate heat exchangers do not require tube plates for the tube bundle 14 of Ohsaki et al. and at the same time allow a very effective heat exchange. It is noted that the reactor disclosed in Ohsaki et al. is not an isothermal reactor since it has adiabatic reaction spaces 10, 11. In view of the foregoing

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 09/852,014
Attorney Docket Q64333
September 20, 2004

distinctions it is clear that independent Claims 1 and 11 as well as dependent Claims 2-9 inclusive are clearly not anticipated by Ohsaki et al. nor would these claims be the least bit obvious in view of the teachings of this reference. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that Claims 1-11 inclusive be allowed and the application passed to issue forthwith.

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview.

Since the due date for responding to the outstanding Office Action fell on a Sunday, the filing of this response on Monday, September 20, 2004, is still considered timely filed.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert V. Sloan
Registration No. 22,775

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 20, 2004